





**THE Siam Advertiser** states that

that!' The good folks at Tientsin must have, as it seems, something to worry and puzzle their brains with. The Franco-Chinese Treaty kept them in excitement, and now it is the weather. At noon you walk out and see the coolies squatting down in the shade, dressed like their ancestors 5,000 years ago, in nothing but a pair of trousers.

we could only look into their hearts we

News has reached this to-day of the most serious floods which Canton has seen for thirty years. For sixty or eighty miles around Canton City, the province is under water. It is feared that the second or third Silk Crops are seriously injured. The Rice crops are damaged to such an extent as to raise the price of the grain here by 26 cents per picul, or may 18 per cent. Injury to property is enormous, and many lives have been lost. Great hardships are anticipated for the poorer inhabitants, who have innumerable instances lost their all. We

lighter to the rice steamers lying in the river. Large numbers of sampans and cargo boats have been overturned and swamped, and during the last four or five days the dead bodies of men, women and children have been seen floating down the

greatest damage appears to have been done by the floods. A large portion of the embankment of the river has there been carried away and three villages entirely submerged, most of the inhabitants being drowned. The authorities

at Canton have sent two gunboats loaded with rice up to the districts where the unfortunate inhabitants have been

The floods appear to have been increasing in extent during the last four or five days, the spring tides now prevailing driving the down current back and adding materially to the overflow of the river.

**'City of Tokio' Ashore.**

A telegram has been received this morning, to the effect that the P. M. S. Co's ship, the "City of Tokio," has been driven ashore.

ashore at Cape Sagami, at the entrance to the Bay of Yedo. The telegram states that the stern of the *Tokio* is full of water. We are informed that the *City of Tokio* was

Co.'s Agent here (Mr F. E. Foster) had received no message regarding the accident up to noon, still it is feared that the mishap is serious enough, as Sagami is in the open sea. The Co.'s Agent at Yokohama must have been occupied in getting assistance to the ship, otherwise he would have wired

earlier. Commander Maury is the oldest and most experienced Captain in the service, and some explanation will doubtless be forthcoming of the mishap. The weather has been bad in that neighbourhood rainy and foggy.

LATER.

The Agent of the Company has received the following telegram:—

'Steamer got ashore on Sagami Point rocks; still badly ashore, with hole in bottom; passengers and crew, mails, specie

**VALUABLES IN LETTERS.**  
We have been requested to publish the following letter regarding the enclosure of

GENERAL POST OFFICE,  
Hongkong, June 24th 1885.

SIR,—In reply to the enquiry instituted by your Office as to a parcel of silk handkerchiefs addressed to Amoy and said to have been forwarded from Canton on the 8th instant, I have the honour to inform

from Canton on the above date was duly forwarded to Amoy per *Achilles* the same afternoon, and, as far as can be recollected in that office, was duly delivered to the addressee, who, however, seems to be making enquiries for some other parcel, which would appear not to have reached its destination.

All this uncertainty would have been avoided by registering the parcel alleged to be missing, the value of which was, I presume, several dollars. I do not know if the sender would have considered an equal amount in Money to the chances of transmission in an unregistered cover, with any idea that it would reach its destination.

done than has been done to disabuse the Canton Community of its belief that valuables may be sent through the post without any sort of precaution. That community, more than any other in China, persists, in spite of all warnings, in forwarding bank notes in unregistered covers. As you are aware, such a cover was received the other

one that had never been gummed. I can only hope repeated losses will convince the

SHARE LIST.—QUOTATIONS.										JUNE 20, 1885.	
Stocks.	No. of Shares.	Value.	Paid-up.	POSITION PER LAST REPORT.	Reserve.	Balance, forward.	Last Dividend.	Closing Value, Cash.	at 100.	at 100.	
BANKS.											
Hongkong and Shanghai Bank Corp.	60,000	£ 125	£ 125	\$ 4,400,000 For equalization of reserves.	£ 400,000	\$ 61,570.2	2 half year	158	%	prem.	
INSURANCE.											
North-China Insurance Co., Ltd.	5,000	£ 200	£ 50	£ 50,000	£ 540,107	£ 300	per share				
Yangtze Insurance Company, Ltd.	8,000	£ 210	£ 25	£ 50,000	£ 130	£ 130	per share				
Union Insurance Society Co., Ltd.	2,000	£ 150	£ 125	£ 334,000	£ 496,329	£ 480	per share				
China Traders' Insurance Co., Ltd.	24,000	£ 53.35	£ 25	£ 400,000	£ 107,381	£ 57	per share			cash	
Canton Insurance Office Co., Ltd.	10,000	£ 250	£ 50	£ 105,000	£ 460,560	£ 32	per share				
Chinese Insurance Co., Limited.	1,500	£ 1,000	£ 200	£ 28,710.51	£ 35,168.20	£ 165	per share				
Hongkong Fire Insurance Co., Ltd.	6,000	£ 25	£ 50	£ 908,609.66	£ 297,568.07	£ 0 for 1883	£ 360	per share		cash	
China Fire Insurance Co., Ltd.	20,000	£ 10	£ 20	£ 547,500	£ 131,060.99	£ 0 for 1883	£ 72	per share		cash, buyers	
STEAM COMPANIES.											
H.K. C. and M. Steamboat Co., Ltd.	4,000	£ 104	£ 76	£ 206,236.55	£ 4,593.98	£ 1/2 year	43	prem.			
Indo-China S. N. Company, Limited.	18,387	£ 10	£ 10	£ 10	£ 25	discount				buyers	
60,000 shares issued.	31,212	£ 10	£ 10	£ 10	£ 25	discount				buyers	
China and Manila S. S. Co., Ltd.	3,500	£ 100	£ 100	£ 100	£ 30	discount					
MISCELLANEOUS.											
H'kong & Whampoa Dock Co., Ltd.	10,000	£ 125	£ 125	£ 18,000	£ 6,683.96	£ 1/2 year	66	prem.			
H.K. and China Gas Co., Limited.	5,000	£ 10	£ 10	£ 8,552.17	£ 10	£ 90	per share, nominal				
New Shares.	1,900	£ 10	£ 10	£ 10	£ 10	£ 10	£ 90	per share, nominal			
Hongkong Hotel Company, Ltd.	2,000	£ 100	£ 100	£ 100	£ 2,488.50	Old, \$3.00 New, \$1.50	Old, \$160 New, \$ 80	per share, buyers			
3,000 shares issued.	1,000	£ 50	£ 50	£ 50	£ 13,274.03	£ 140	per share				
China Sugar Company, Limited.	9,000	£ 100	£ 100	£ 100	£ 323.35	£ 110	per share				
Hongkong Ice Company, Limited.	1,250	£ 100	£ 100	£ 30,000	£ 442.11	£ 810	£ 810	per share			
Hongkong Paper Co., Ltd.	600	£ 30	£ 50	£ 4,000	£ 320.03	£ 240	£ 240	per share		ex div., buyers	
Lezun Sugar Company, Limited.	7,000	£ 100	£ 100	£ 100	£ 320.03	£ 240	£ 240	per share		ex div., buyers	
Perak Tin Mining & S'ing Co., Ltd.	5,000	£ 60	£ 100	£ 100	£ 100	£ 110	£ 110	per share		nominal	
Selangore Tin Mining Co. (S'hai).	2,500	£ 100	£ 100	£ 100	£ 100	£ 110	£ 110	per share		nominal	
H'kong Rope Manufacturing Co., Ltd.	3,000	£ 50	£ 100	£ 100	£ 100	£ 110	£ 110	per share		cash	
LOANS.											
Chinese Imperial 1881.	8,555	TL 500	all	8 %	June 1 & Dec 10	per					
" " 1884.	2790	TL 500	all	8 %	March 15	per					
" " 1884.	2790	TL 500	all	8 %	June 30	per					
Sugar Debentures, 1880.	600	TL 500	all	8 %	June & Dec 31	per				prem.	

**Admission:** June 19; *Edikta*, June 19; *Complon*, *Ilwari*, *Melloune*, and *Ipikine*, June 16; *Truand*, June 19; *Glengary*, *Stenker*, *Arabi*, *Bratogua*, June 23.  
**HOMEWARD BOUND**—*Anchises*, June 6; *Danielson*, June 9; *Glengary*, June 19; *Oopak*, June 23.  
**THE PRINCE PELOE**, by the M. M. Co.'s str. *Peilo*, left Saigon on the 23rd inst., at 9 a.m., and may be expected here on or about Friday morning, the 26th inst.  
**THE D. D. R. steamer *Fronia*** left Singapore for this port on the 21st inst., and may be expected here on or about the 27th inst.  
**THE O. S. S. Co.'s steamer *Antenor*** left Singapore for this port on the 22nd inst., and may be expected here on the 28th inst.  
**THE SHIRE LINE S. S. *Broomfield*** left Singapore for this port on the 22nd inst., and may be expected to arrive here on or about the 28th inst.  
**DOCK MOVEMENTS**—  
 The S. S. *Names* left Aberdeen Dock to-day.  
 The *Timor* will leave Cosmopolitan Dock to-morrow.  
**THE SHEN PAO** publishes a rumour that the English Government has given its consent to increase the tax on every chest of opium imported into China to Tls. 110.  
**THE main-pollant mast of the American bark *Wildwood*** was struck by lightning during the short storm yesterday forenoon. But little damage was done.  
**WE call** the attention of shipping agents, ship's officers and others interested, to a Police notification relating to the loading and discharging of vessels at night, which appears in our advertisement columns.  
**MONSIEUR G. Lemaire**, late French Resident at Hué, and Mr. A. R. Hewlett, late H.B.M. Consul at Canton, left here for Europe in the French mail steamer *Ozma* to-day.  
**THE French corvette *La Perouse***, which arrived here this morning from the Poedores, brought down six piote as passengers. This shows that some of the French fleet are preparing to leave for Home.



senders of these packets that this Office means what it says when it warns them that valuable property sent through the post is at their risk.

Meanwhile I have to request you rigorously to refuse every article tendered for unregistered transmission which has the least appearance of being valuable.

I have the honor to be, Sir,  
Your obedient servant,  
A. Lister,  
Postmaster General,  
P. O. Box 100, Canton.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

## THE LUCKY THIEF.

To the Editor of the "China Mail."  
Hongkong, 26th June 1885.  
SIR,—I have read your remarks on the shortcomings and indifference of the officials whose duty it was to see that everything connected with the case of Pang A-po (the servant of Mr. Leonard, second engineer of the steamer *Keweenaw*) was in order prior to its being placed before a jury; and also what you have said about the inexplicable conduct of the learned Attorney-General in whose discretionary power rested the right of a post-mortem in order to secure the conviction of the culprit. Your remarks furnish a good, sober, and convincing evidence; and are worthy of the representative of the Fourth Estate; and I am sure the public will endorse every word of the same. But, Mr. Editor, my object in penning these lines is not to repeat this deplorable subject beyond what is already in print, but to draw your attention by way of compensation due to Mr. Leonard, the innocent victim of official delinquency. You will see, in the event of the action of the Attorney-General being carried out, the poor fellow will not only lose his fifty dollars but another hundred in the hospital making in all one hundred and fifty. This would indeed inflict a great hardship; and under the circumstances I would propose that a subscription be started amongst the inhabitants of the Colony, limiting the amount to one dollar each, to defray the disbursement of the system by which justice or rather injustice is carried out here. I am certain contributions will flow in very rapidly if properly advertised.

An Old Resident.

The subscription to which "An Old Resident" here alludes could be started and made up in a few hours, but there is a possibility that the Governor in Council will not seek to recover the sum of the recognizances. Would it not be better to appeal against the decision, or to address a memorial to the Government, setting forth the danger involved in the position in the present course of action to the security of life and property in the Colony? There is practically no check to similar action save that of a public protest, and the matter is getting to be grave enough to justify such a step being taken. Let the subscription be made also by all means.—E. C. M.

## 'WHAT A NIGHT' WE'RE HAVING.

To the Editor of the "China Mail."  
June 25, 1885.  
SIR,—Did you hear the infernal row which was being kicked up by Gunga, Duntoms and Cyabals at the Hollywood Road Joss House last evening? This din began somewhere about sundown and lasted without interruption until daylight this morning, and I am told by my informant that the nuisance will be continued for about a week longer. I must ask you how it is that the Police permit such an undoubted nuisance to take place from time to time at the Building? I pity the sick men, women and children round about who are kept awake by the noise of the strong and healthy, who also like to get some sleep on these hot nights. What about the quietude of the Free Hospital? It is intended to build not far from the delightful Joss House? It is a great pity that the Government House, the nearest to Government House, the Police would not be doing in abating the shameful nuisance there.

Yours, &c.,  
BOYMAN ROAD.

## SUPREME COURT.

IN ORIGINAL JURISDICTION.  
(Before His Hon. E. J. A. Croft, Chief Justice.)  
Thursday, June 25.

W. McGRUGHER SMITH v. A. E. JACKSON.  
Mr. Francis, instructed by Messrs Wootton and Duncan, appeared for the plaintiff; the Attorney-General (Hon. E. L. O'Malley), instructed by Mr. Caldwell, for the defendant.

Mr. Francis read the petition, which set out that the plaintiff was a gentleman and the defendant a merchant, both residing at Victoria, Hongkong. On the 11th March last the defendant agreed to sell and deliver to the plaintiff on or before eleven a.m. on the 12th March 90 Chinese Government Loan Bonds issued by the Chartered Bank of India, Australia, and China, at \$45.00 nominal value, and at two per cent. discount; and the plaintiff agreed to accept and pay for the same on those terms. He had always been ready to accept and pay for the bonds, and all things happened and all lines elapsed to entitle him to their delivery, but the defendant had failed to deliver them. The market price at the time the defendant should have delivered the bonds was two per cent. premium above the nominal value, and the plaintiff claimed \$1,800 as the difference between that and his contract price, and costs of suit.

The defendant's reply to the petition admitted the contract with the exception of the time specified for its performance. At 11 a.m. on the 12th March he denied that there was any agreement as to any hour that day. That, however, Mr. Francis said, was not a matter of great importance, as the plaintiff had allowed the defendant the whole day in which to complete his contract and deliver the bonds. The defendant denied that at the time the contract should have been fulfilled the market price of these bonds was 2 per cent. premium, and he alleged that he had offered the plaintiff 33 bonds of that description on the 12th March at the agreed price, and as to the remaining 57 he had offered to pay the plaintiff the difference in price between the contract price and the market price. He had agreed to sell at \$45.00 per bond, and the market price then was \$49.00, one per cent. discount, but the plaintiff refused to accept the offer. The defendant paid \$375 into court as sufficient to satisfy the plaintiff's claim.

Mr. Francis said he did not think the matter of the hour agreed was material, and the only important question of fact in dispute was the market price of the bonds at the time the contract should have been fulfilled. There was a question of law as to whether his client was bound to accept the part fulfilment of the contract. Mr. A. G. Gubbay said he was a member of the firm of Cohen and Gubbay, there

brokers, Hongkong. On the 11th March last he was commissioned by Mr. McGrugher Smith to purchase for him 90 Chinese Imperial Government Loan Bonds. He had some instructions to sell some bonds from Mr. Jackson, and he negotiated the terms between the parties. The broker's note produced was the same as he had sent to him, and it was a notification to Mr. McGrugher Smith that he had purchased \$45,000 worth of Chinese Bonds issued by the Chartered Bank of India, Australia, and China at two per cent. discount, delivery the next day at eleven a.m.

The Attorney-General objected that the document was not a contract, and under the provisions of law must be stamped, which this document was not.

Mr. Francis argued that the document was not a contract, merely an intimation of purchase to obtain the bonds.

The Attorney-General thought the recent conviction of Mr. Rangul was a case precisely in point.

Mr. Francis said if the Court held the document was not a contract, the plaintiff would be entitled to obtain the bonds and pay the penalty and stamp duty.

Witness continued—He could not see Mr. Jackson at his office at 11 a.m. the next day, but he saw him later. Mr. Jackson did not deliver the bonds, and witness wrote to him informing him the time for the delivery was past, and he understood him (Mr. Jackson) was not prepared to deliver more than \$16,500 worth of bonds.

Mr. McGrugher Smith instructed him not to accept those or any part fulfilment of the contract, and if the bonds were not delivered by 2 p.m. he should buy the same and look to Mr. Jackson for the difference. Mr. Jackson wrote in reply to this that he could hand him \$16,500 worth of the bonds, and the balance the next day. He could not agree to Mr. Smith buying the bonds on the market and charging him with the difference. Witness had not inquired whether there were any such bonds on the market that morning, nor their price. He believed there were none on the market that afternoon.

Cross-examined—He did not attempt to buy any more bonds, and he was not instructed to do so. The reason he refused to accept the \$16,500 worth of bonds tendered was that he was instructed not to do so. This offer was the best offer he had seen in the market that day.

Mr. W. Legge, shareholder, was then called.

Mr. Legge said—Before I give evidence I wish to know if there is any fee for giving evidence in this case, as I have orders to creditors outside.

His Lordship—If there is any fee it will be paid you.

Mr. Legge—Well I only asked because the last time I was called there was no fee. His Lordship said a rate of fees was to have been fixed but had not been arranged yet.

Witness—On the 12th March he had a commission to buy 90 Chinese Government Loan Bonds for Mr. Smith. There was none in the open market, and he went to the Chartered Bank of India, Australia, and China, where the manager told him he could let him have \$45,000 worth at three per cent. premium. Witness said the price was ridiculous, and the manager lowered the price one per cent. to put him down to \$44,000.

Cross-examined—Those were the only bonds offered to witness at any price at all that day. He made all the inquiries he thought necessary. He was aware there were many bonds on the market at a lower price than the one offered to him.

The Attorney-General said the defendant raised no question as to the contract.

His Lordship said there was the question as to the hour fixed for delivery.

Mr. Francis said that was mentioned in the contract.

Mr. Smither, the Judge's Clerk, said that the note supplied to Mr. Smith contained the time, but in the one supplied to Mr. Jackson there was no mention of it.

Mr. Francis said it was not material, as his client allowed the defendant the whole day to complete his contract.

The Attorney-General said he did not care to base his case upon the contention that the plaintiff was bound to accept the \$16,500 worth of bonds in part performance of the contract, but he said those charges were evidence of the market price prevailing at the time.

He had evidence that these shares had been offered to the purchaser, and he might have obtained them at that price. As to the balance of the shares bargained for, he should bring evidence to show that the shares were to be delivered upon the market at a lower price than two per cent. premium; they could have been obtained at one per cent. discount, and was quite open to the plaintiff. If he had accepted defendant's offer to have taken the shares at the instant price, and allowed the defendant to pay the difference. He called the following evidence.

Mr. Poseneker, of the firm of Arnold, Karberg & Co., said he had had some negotiations with Mr. Jackson as to the purchase of Chinese bonds. On the 12th March he asked him if he had any bonds for sale, and witness told him he had 36 or 38 at Canton at one per cent. discount. Defendant wanted to deliver that afternoon. Witness wrote to him on the 13th, refusing to the offer to sell at one per cent. discount.

Mr. Francis objected to the letter being received in evidence on the ground that it was irrelevant, the date not affecting this contract.

The Attorney-General pointed out that the letter referred to an offer made the previous day.

Witness was not a share broker, and he could not say what shares there were on the market. He was never offered a better price than one per cent. discount.

Mr. T. H. Whitehead, Manager of the Chartered Bank of India, Australia, and China, said he was asked to sell Chinese bonds on a day in March by Mr. Jackson, and by Mr. Legge. He offered to sell the amount inquired for at two per cent. premium. He had sold none at that rate, and he had sold none at any premium. He could not say there were bonds in the market at that time, but he had heard there were. He made a contract with Cohen and Vernon subsequently to purchase bonds at 4 per cent. discount, but they had not yet been delivered. He believed that at that time persons were trying to depreciate the market, and bonds having been offered at four per cent. discount, and he had taken them off the market. He would not sell any bonds under par, and had not done so. This transaction was subsequent to the interview with Mr. Jackson and Mr. Legge, perhaps ten days or a fortnight. Mr. Legge had a gentleman from whom he bought the bonds at four per cent. discount, but they were not delivered. He had sold many shares at par, but none above and none below it. Witness would not, on the 12th March, have sold the bonds at less than two per cent. premium. He had sold them at two per cent. discount, but he was not offered a better price. He merely said which might have been bona fide or otherwise, and he regarded them as not bona fide. Witness declined

to say unless he was compelled, what he would have sold on a bona fide offer.

His Lordship put the question.

Witness—I asked two per cent. premium, and I should have been satisfied if I had obtained it.

Mr. Francis objected that the Attorney-General was cross-examining his own witness.

The Attorney-General—If you had a bona fide offer of par for these shares that day are you prepared to say you would have accepted it?

Witness—I asked two per cent., and I should have been satisfied to accept it. The Attorney-General said that was not an answer, and he pressed for a direct answer to the question.

His Lordship thought the Attorney-General must be satisfied with the answer. The Attorney-General submitted that as he had been allowed to put the question he was entitled to an answer of yes or no.

Mr. Whitehead said it was impossible for him to say at this date what he might have done.

His Lordship said he was a broker. On the 12th March he had an application made to him to obtain some Chinese Government Loan Bonds. He made inquiries, and found he was able to obtain them at one per cent. discount. He did not know how many he could have obtained, but probably a great number as the person from whom he made inquiries gave the price as one per cent. discount. Witness when asked and told Mr. Jackson of the offer.

Cross-examined by Mr. Francis—The seller of the shares was a Chinese merchant named Yu Kung, who was then keeping his shop at the Yau Lung. Witness could not say whether he had the bonds here or at Canton. Witness went to this man because he had formerly been with him to the Chartered Bank and saw him purchase \$20,000 worth. He could not remember the date of this occurrence, but he remembered the 12th March as he did some business with Yu Kung on that day. Witness now lived at Swatow, but at that time he was a broker here in Hongkong. Neither he nor Yu Kung had any transactions with Mr. Jackson or Mr. Legge.

Mr. Jackson knew witness had been with Yu to buy these shares at the Bank. By His Lordship—Witness could not say how many bonds he could have bought. He could certainly have bought some.

Mr. Smith was called by the Attorney-General and in answer to questions from him he said he had not purchased Chinese bonds before this transaction. When he found Mr. Jackson could not supply the bonds, he went to the Chartered Bank and purchased \$20,000 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

His Lordship said that Mr. Smith's reasons for refusing to take part delivery were immaterial.

Witness continued—He sent a broker, Mr. Legge, to buy the shares on his behalf. He had refused to take the \$16,500 worth of Mr. Jackson's as he had made arrangements to take the \$45,000 worth, and he could not invest the money in portions; he could not break the total. He represented the sum.

Mr. Francis objected to Mr. Smith being examined on the point.



**THE CHINA REVIEW.**

Agents, Hongkong & Canton  
Hongkong, January 4, 1887.

A. PAPERS will be thankfully received at the Sailor's Home, West Point.  
Hongkong, July 25, 1873.

Copies may be had at the *China Mail* Office, and at Messrs. LANE, CRAWFORD & Co.,—Price, 75 cents

SHIPPING IN CHINA, JAPAN,  
PHILIPPINES, AND SIAM  
WATERS

**PHILIPPINES, AND SIAM**  
**WATERS.**  
**WHAMPOA.**

Vessel's Name.	Flag & Reg.	Destination.
Ningpo	Brit.	str. Shanghai
Peking	Brit.	str. Shanghai

**CANTON.**

**MERCHANT SAILING VESSELS.**

Emvay	Brit.	str.
Estrella	Span.	str.
Mary Austin	Brit.	str.

**MAOAO.**

Kiang-ping	Amer.	str. Canton
------------	-------	-------------

**SWATOW.**

In port on June 16, 1865.

**MERCHANT STEAMERS.**

Atholl	British
Fidelio	British

**AMOY.**

In port on June 13, 1865.

**MERCHANT STEAMERS.**

Douglas	British
Daburg	German
Glasavon	British
Hae-shin	American

**MERCHANT SAILING VESSELS.**

Auguste	Br. Sm.sch.
L'Arvenier	Brit. bqe.
Charley	Brit. bqe.
Hugo & Otto	Norw. bqe.
M. A. Dixon	Brit. bqe.
Loong Wha	Brit. sch.

**FOOCHOW.**

In port on June 12, 1865.

**MERCHANT STEAMERS.**

Glouceagles	British
Killarney	British
Ningchow	British

**MERCHANT SAILING VESSELS.**

Minna	Brit. bqe.
Hedvig	Brit. bqe.
Wagrien	Ger. sch.

**SHANGHAI.**

In port on June 20, 1865.

**MERCHANT STEAMERS.**

Achilles	British
Ancona	Russian
Casapedia	British
Denbighshire	British
Gankai Maru	Japanese
Hever	German
Kiang-piau	American
Kiang-yung	American
Ningpo	British
Oxus	French
Paris	British
Saghalien	French
Soww	British

Nagasaki, &c.	
Hankow, &c.	
Hongkong, &c.	
H'kong, &c.	

Shanghai	British	Hankow, &c.
Taiwo	British	Hankow, &c.
Telamon	British	
Welle	German	
Wan-on	British	
Yuen Wo	British	

**MERCHANT SAILING VESSELS.**

Chingtho	Chi.	bqe. Laid up
Ch. Wattana	Siam	bqe.
Helena	Brit.	bqe.
Iolanthe	Brit.	sh.
Meridian	Siam.	bqe.
Northern Star	Brit.	bqe.

**\* NAGASAKI.**

In port on June 6, 1885.

Kozaki Maru \* Japan. bqe.

**YOKOHAMA.**

In port on June 6, 1885.

Androkles	Brit.	bqe.
C. B. Carver	Am.	sh.
Guam	Brit.	bqe.
Harmonia	Ger.	sh.
Isabel	Brit.	bqe.
Lennie Burrill	Brit.	sh.

Loiterer	Brit.	sch.
Mary C. Bohm	Ger.	sch.
Pactolus	Amer.	sh.

---

**HIOGO.**

In port on May 11, 1855.

Queen Emma	Brit.	bqg.
------------	-------	------

---

**MANILA.**

In port on May 15, 1855.

Christine	Ger.	bqg.
Gamen	Swed.	bqg.
Hudson	Amer.	bqg.
Margarita	Span.	bg.
Mervion	Amer.	bqg.
Wakefield	Amer.	bqg.

---

**ILOILO.**

George Moon	Ger.	bqg.
Thos. Dana	Amer.	sh.
Ternogura	Brit.	sh.

---

**CEBU.**

Samar	Amer.	sh.
Sarnatian	Brit.	sh.

---

**BANGKOK.**

In port on June 6, 1855.

Advance	Siam.	bqg.
Amity	Brit.	bqg.
Bua Pau	Siam.	bqg.
Ch'ron Kamroy	Siam.	bqg.
C. Wattana	Siam.	bqg.
Cometana	Swed.	bqg.
Dorsetta	Siam.	bg.
Envoy	Siam.	bqg.
Fortune	Siam.	sch.
Goliath	Siam.	bqg.
Hei Cheong	Brit.	bqg.
Napier	Brit.	sh.
Kim Chye Seng	Siam.	sch.
Koon Lee	Siam.	sch.
Queen of England	Siam.	sh.
Siamese Crown	Siam.	sh.
S. Hameed	Brit.	sch.

---

Printed and published by GEO. MURRAY  
BARR, at the China Mail Office, No.  
Wynham Street, Hongkong.